



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,584	04/16/2001	Christopher E. Mitchell	MS1-775US	7869

22801 7590 05/13/2005

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/836,584

Applicant(s)

MITCHELL ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/24/2005 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on January 24, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1-47 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al (US 5,678, 041).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Baker teaches:

(1) associating a first entity with a second entity in a first device [i.e., as shown in Figure 1, the system includes public network 100, network resources 101-105, and user site 106. Particular users at user site 106 gain access to public network 100 via user terminals 107, 108 and 109. Each of these user terminals is linked by local area network ("LAN") 110 to processor 111 within proxy server 112 (column 3, lines 60-65)]; and

(2) selectively providing information about the association of the first and second entities to a second device as directed by the first entity, without requiring the second entity to be operatively associated with either the first or second device [i.e., relational database 114 stores a list of user terminal identification codes and the various user clearances reflective of the ratings of network resources that each user terminal should be allowed to retrieve from public network 100. It will be understood that the invention could be modified so that the list of user clearances associated with a given user terminal identification code serves as a restrictive list (i.e.; that user is not allowed to retrieve network

Art Unit: 2135

resources having that rating). This restrictive listing functionality could be readily facilitated by reprogramming processor 111. In addition, the invention could be modified so that the identification codes recognized by processor 111 and stored in relational database 114 are user specific, as opposed to user terminal specific. In other words, the system of Figure 1 could be modified so that a given individual using a terminal is identified to the system by a personal password or other identifying code. Access or denial of the transmission of particular URLs is effected by the system as a function of that person's identity, regardless of the particular user terminal they may be utilizing (column 5, lines 45-65)].

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the first entity and the second entity are selected from a group of entities that includes users, organizations, companies, devices, computers, servers, computer programs, and applications [i.e., as shown in Figure 1, the system includes public network 100, network resources 101-105, and user site 106 (column 3, lines 60-61)].

c. Referring to claims 3-8, 33-36, 39, 41-44:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

d. Referring to claim 9:

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the first entity is a parent/guardian of the second entity [i.e., Baker's invention overcomes the deficiencies of prior schemes for regulating network database access by providing a system and method that allows one or more network administrators/managers, that is "parent/guardian", to rate particular information and/or services. This rating is then employed to restrict specific system users from accessing the information/services via certain public or otherwise uncontrolled databases (i.e., the WWW and the Internet) (column 3, lines 7-15)].

e. Referring to claim 10:

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the first device includes a network server that is configured to act as an authentication server [i.e., **proxy server 112 provides a connection from processor 111 to public network 100 via firewall 113. Requests from user terminals 107-109 for access to network resources (101-105) through public network 100 are submitted to processor 111 within proxy server 112. In this particular embodiment of the invention, the submitted requests are assumed to be in the form of URLs. When URLs are submitted to a proxy server (that is "authentication server"), the particular requesting user terminal is identified to the proxy server by an identification header attached to the URL. (column 3, line 65 through column 4, line 9)]].**

f. Referring to claim 11:

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the second device includes a network server that is configured to act as an affiliated server associated with the authentication server [i.e., **within the system of Figure 1, URLs designated as URL.sub.101, URL.sub.102, URL.sub.103, URL.sub.104 and URL.sub.105, represent requests for information from network resources 101, 102, 103, 104 and 105 (these are "affiliate servers"), respectively (column 4, lines 12-16)]].**

g. Referring to claims 12, 32:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

h. Referring to claims 13, 38:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

i. Referring to claims 14-19:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 12, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

j. Referring to claims 20, 29, 45:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 9 above.

k. Referring to claims 21, 30, 47:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 10, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 10 above.

l. Referring to claims 22, 31, 46:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 11, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

m. Referring to claim 23:

i. Baker teaches:

(1) memory having information associating a first user of the apparatus with a second user of the apparatus [i.e., as shown in Figure 1, the system includes public network 100, network resources 101-105, and user site 106. Particular users at user site 106 gain access to public network 100 via user terminals 107, 108 and 109. Each of these user terminals is linked by local area network ("LAN") 110 to processor 111 within proxy server 112 (column 3, lines 60-65). The above described system may also be modified so that URLs are identified as being in a rating category within the memory structure of a relational database (column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 1)]; and

(2) logic operatively coupled to the memory and configured to respond to inputs from the first user by selectively outputting the information about the association of the first user and the second user, without requiring the second user to be operatively signed-in to the apparatus [i.e., for example, if a system manager wished to modify relational database 302 from user terminal 108, he or she would enter a password identifying themselves as an authorized system manager. The password is received by processor 111 and compared with the contents of manager ID memory listing 304. If the received manager ID password corresponds to one stored in listing 304, then user terminal 108 is identified as a manager terminal (as indicated by ID.sub.108 being stored within listing 304). Modifications to the contents of relational database 302 may then be

effected from that user terminal. When all modifications have been completed, the manager logs off and user terminal 108 returns to standard user terminal status (i.e., ID.sub.108 is cleared from listing 304) (column 7, lines 3-16 and claim 1 (2))].

n. Referring to claim 24:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 23, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

o. Referring to claims 25-28:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 23, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

p. Referring to claims 37, 40:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 23, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

Response to Argument

4. Applicant's arguments filed January 24, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that:

Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest "associating a first entity with a second entity in a first device" as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the referenced portion of Baker merely describes user terminals linked by a local area network. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection made by the Office is unclear. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Examiner disagrees with applicant and still maintains that:

Baker teaches the claimed subject matter. As a matter of fact, requests from user terminals 107-109 for access to network resources (101-105) through public network 100 are submitted to processor 111 within proxy server 112. In this particular embodiment of the invention, the submitted requests are assumed to be in the form of URLs. As is well known in art, when URLs are submitted to a proxy server, the particular requesting user terminal is identified to the proxy server by an identification header attached to the URL. For the system shown in Figure 1, the identification code

for user terminal 107 is ID.sub.107, the identification code for user terminal 108 is ID.sub.108, and the identification code for user terminal 109 is ID.sub.109. In addition, within the system of Figure 1, URLs designated as URL.sub.101, URL.sub.102, URL.sub.103, URL.sub.104 and URL.sub.105, represent requests for information from network resources 101, 102, 103, 104 and 105, respectively (column 4, lines 1-16).

Applicant further argues that:

Baker does not disclose information about an association between of first and second entities.

Examiner totally disagrees with applicant and again maintains that:

Baker does teach the claimed subject matter. Furthermore, upon receipt of an incoming URL, processor 111 is programmed to determine the identity of the requesting user terminal from the URL header. This identification information is then utilized by processor 111 to cross-reference the received URL with information stored in relational database 114. Relational database 114 contains listing 115 which associates each of the user identification codes (ID.sub.107, ID.sub.108 and ID.sub.109) with a user clearance code (user clearances.sub.107, user clearances.sub.108 and user clearances.sub.109, respectively). These user clearances indicate the particular rating class or classes of network resources that a given user terminal is allowed to access (i.e.; unlimited access; restricted use of URLs identified as accessing violent subject matter; restricted use of URLs that are identified as accessing obscene subject matter; etc). Also contained in relational database 114 is listing 116 which includes a register of allowable URLs (URL.sub.101-105) that may be transmitted from a user terminal to access network resources (column 4, lines 17-35). In response to applicant's argument that a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested (see applicant's remarks, page 14, lines 4-6), a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the

prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Applicant further argues that:

Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest information about wherein the first entity is a parent/guardian of the second entity.

Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant and still maintains that:

Baker does teach the claimed subject matter. In fact, referring to Figure 1, the processor 111 could also be programmed to deny all requests from user terminals for un-rated resources. This would prohibit the accessing of network resources that had not been reviewed or rated by the system administrator/manager (column 5, lines 36-40).

Applicant further argues that:

Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest information about a validation code that identifies a first entity and a second entity.

Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant and still maintains that:

Baker does teach the claimed subject matter. Furthermore, upon receipt of an incoming URL, processor 111 is programmed to determine the identity of the requesting user terminal from the URL header. This identification information is then utilized by processor 111 to cross-reference the received URL with information stored in relational database 114. Relational database 114 contains listing 115 which associates each of the user identification codes (ID.sub.107, ID.sub.108 and ID.sub.109) with a user clearance code (user clearances.sub.107, user clearances.sub.108 and user clearances.sub.109, respectively) (column 4, lines 17-25).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

a. Mi et al (US 6,418,472) discloses a system and method for using internet based caller ID for controlling access to an object stored in a computer. The

Art Unit: 2135


system stores an object and a processor identifier. The system includes a verification agent that can access information embedded in a processor and then calculate from that embedded information a value that may be compared with the stored processor identifier (see abstract). In addition, such a "caller ID" feature may apply to on-line banking, remote user dial in to access confidential information, and communications (e.g., to control access to chat rooms or private teleconferences, or to facilitate on-line game usage). In addition, such a "caller ID" feature may enable parental control to prevent children from accessing various web sites (column 1, lines 30-36).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100